

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 to 12 and 14 to 31 are pending in the application, with Claim 15 having been amended herein. Claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 18, 19 and 23 to 31 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification was objected to for allegedly failing to mention reference 108 of Figure 1, reference 11 of Figure 2, reference S24 of Figure 6, and reference S46 of Figure 8. With respect to reference 108 of Figure 1 and reference S46 of Figure 8, Applicant submits that the Request For Approval Of Drawing Changes filed concurrently herewith renders moot the objections based on these Figures. With respect to the objections based on reference 11 of Figure 2 and reference S24 of Figure 6, Applicant respectfully submits that these objections are in error and should be withdrawn. In particular, reference 11 of Figure 2 corresponds to database module 11 which is discussed in the specification at page 10, line 22. With respect to reference S24 of Figure 6, the specification clearly describes, at page 17, lines 5 to 7, that steps S31 to S33 are to be performed in between steps S24 and S25 of Figure 3. Accordingly, references 11 and S24 are discussed in the specification with respect to Figures 2 and 6. Based on the foregoing, Applicant requests withdrawal of all objections to the specification.

Claim 15 was objected to for an informality. Applicant submits that the amendment to Claim 15 herein renders moot this objection and therefore requests withdrawal of the objection to Claim 15.

Claims 1, 3 to 12 and 14 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,502 (Salkewicz) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,649,196 (Woodhill). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus which can access a plurality of databases. The apparatus includes first copying means for copying data selected from a first database to a second database, determination means for determining if each of attribute items of attribute information appended to the data corresponds to each of attribute items of the second database, and second copying means for copying information of an attribute item, which is determined by the determination means to correspond to one of the attribute items of the second database, to a corresponding attribute item of the second database, and for copying information of an attribute item that is determined by the determination means not to correspond to any of the attribute items of the second database, to the predetermined attribute item of the second database.

The applied art, namely Salkewicz and Woodhill, is not seen to disclose or suggest the foregoing features of independent Claim 1. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest, when copying data selected from a first database to a second database, determining if each of attribute items of attribute information appended to the data corresponds to each of attribute items of the second database, and then copying information of an attribute item, which is determined to correspond to one of the attribute items of the second database, to a corresponding attribute item of the second database, and copying information of an attribute item that is determined not to correspond to any of the attribute items of the second database, to the predetermined attribute item of the second database. In this manner, data can be copied between different types of databases without loss of attribute data.

Salkewicz is seen to be directed to a method for synchronizing a first database comprised of a plurality of records with a second database by dividing the records of the first database into segments and then transferring each segment to the second database. (Salkewicz, abstract; Figure 10; and column 2, lines 33 to 46). In this regard, Salkewicz is seen to be concerned with synchronizing multiple copies of database so as to minimize both the time during which database access is halted and the cost associated with making copies of the database. According to Salkewicz, the records of the first database are divided into a plurality of segments, each of which contains at least one database record.

Although Salkewicz teaches merely synchronizing database records among a plurality of databases wherein each record is transferred to the second database intact, Salkewicz is not seen to teach or suggest copying data from the first database to second database wherein the second database is comprised of attribute items which are different from the attribute items of the first data base. Accordingly, Salkewicz is not seen to teach or suggest determining if each of attribute items of attribute information appended to the data from the first database corresponds to each of attribute items of the second database, and then copying the attribute items to the second database in accordance with this determination.

Woodhill is seen to be directed to a distributed system for storing data in a networked computer system. (Woodhill, abstract; Figure 5A; and column 2, lines 3 to 38). In this regard, Woodhill is seen to teach performing backup of files between different computers or operating systems by selecting an object (file) to be copied on the basis of a calculated binary object identifier (74 of Figure 3) corresponding to the object. (Woodhill,

Figure 3, item 74; column 4, lines 43 to 47; column 8, lines 2 to 65; and column 9, lines 14 to 28). However, Woodhill is not seen to teach or suggest comparing attribute items between a first and second database in order to judge into which attribute item of the second database each attribute information from the first database should be copied. Accordingly, Woodhill is not seen to teach or suggest determining if each of attribute items of attribute information appended to the data from the first database corresponds to each of attribute items of the second database, and then copying the attribute items to the second database in accordance with this determination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Salkewicz and Woodhill, either alone or in combination, are not seen to teach or suggest a copying operation between databases which have different sets of attribute items, as in independent Claim 1. In addition, any combination of Salkewicz and Woodhill is not seen to provide any motivation or hint to reach the combination of the invention of independent Claim 1 where it is determined if each of attribute items of the first database corresponds to each of attribute items of the second database, and information of an attribute item of the first database that is determined not to correspond to any of the attribute items of the second database is copied to a predetermined attribute item of the second database.

It is suggested in the Office Action that if one database contains U.S. patents and the other database contains Japanese patents, then the patent numbers and the dates (attribute items) will not correspond (mismatched) when copied from the U.S. patents database to the Japanese patents database. Applicants submit that this is a basic misunderstanding of the claimed invention. In particular, the present invention does not compare *contents* of each attribute between first and second databases, but instead

compares attribute items (type of attribute) between the databases, such as "patent number" and "filing date". So, for example, the U.S. database may contain the attribute "Attorney" for identifying the attorney who prosecuted the application, while the Japanese database does not contain an attribute "Attorney". In such a case, it must be decided what to do with the attribute "Attorney" from the U.S. database when copying a record from the U.S. database to the Japanese database. The present claimed invention addresses this problem through its determining and copying means (steps), but the applied art does not.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing, independent Claim 1 is believed to be in allowable condition and such action is respectfully requested. Independent Claim 7 contains at least similar features as that of independent Claim 1, wherein the second database is a backup database. Independent Claim 8 also contains at least similar features as that of independent Claim 1, wherein the determination means is replaced by holding and conversion means. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 7 and 8 are also believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 12, 18, 19 and 23 to 31 are directed to method claims, database system claims, method to control database system claims, and storage medium claims, all of which include at least the features of independent Claims 1, 7 and 8, respectively. Accordingly, independent Claims 12, 18, 19 and 23 to 31 are also believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1, 7 and 8, and such action is respectfully requested.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 40,595

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 52214 v 1